

## Preliminary Synthesis of Public Input – Stakeholder Interviews

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
1. How many subareas are there?	<p>Eastern side is tourism based</p> <p>Disconnect State sets AMI at rural not resort levels.</p> <p>County east/west division is a moving line either at West Glenwood or New Castle. Current comp plan subareas make no sense.</p>	<p>FG A: Business and Tourism</p> <p>FG: Education Sector</p> <p>FG: Land Development.</p>	<p>Currently there are 5. Are they all that different?</p> <p>Are Rifle’s aspirations really that different from Carbondale?</p>	<p>A. No sub-areas, county is treated as a whole</p> <p>B. Two sub-areas that reflect different values and growth objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ West end to Silt</li> <li>▪ New Castle to Carbondale</li> </ul> <p>C. 5 sub-areas per 2000 comp plan</p>	<p>Ask in keypad polling.</p> <p>Ask in stakeholder interviews.</p> <p>Check County Survey for indications of differing values.</p>
2. How does each chapter deal with various sub-areas?	Different rules will apply to the East/West	FG: BOCC/PC	<p>As separate sub-sections? (really two documents)</p> <p>Or is it a general discussion with a two-column table?</p>		

### I. Maintaining/Improving a Balanced Economy

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (D), Policies (P), Actions (A)	Further study needs
1. How does the County “work” financially today?	Finance is taking on a new process, goal oriented budgeting	Staff Lunch.	<p>County is funded by: (in order)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oil/gas revenues</li> <li>▪ Grants</li> <li>▪ Property taxes</li> <li>▪ Sales taxes (some are dedicated)</li> </ul> <p>City properties pay the majority of the county property taxes.</p> <p>Cities provide a higher level of urban services than the County. Cities live by sales tax—that’s where most of the</p>		<p>Summary of sources and uses of funds, and past trends.</p> <p>Current policy on County sharing of sales tax.</p> <p>Can goal-oriented budgeting apply to the comp plan?</p> <p>County has a sales tax that goes toward Roads, and another tax that is shared...</p>

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (D), Policies (P), Actions (A)	Further study needs
			commercial is.		
2. Is the oil and gas assessment (forecast) still valid?	<p>Industry is restructuring, gas needs to see an increase in per barrel cost and production will rise. Difficult to predict year by year growth. Don't see a return to the 2004-2008 production levels.</p> <p>The County budget impacts may change as a significant portion of the budget is severance tax and this may be kept by the state for other programs.</p> <p>The County will need to be diligent to get grant monies.</p> <p>2015 production will level off, likely a billion dollar infrastructure deficit.</p>	FG: Oil and Gas.	<p>Highest revenue, and cost (road impacts), from oil/gas industry is during drilling phase. That will gradually diminish. Eventually oil/gas revenues will diminish significantly.</p> <p>It makes sense, today, to make decisions that will support smart (cost-effective) growth patterns for when that day comes.</p>		Update on oil&gas trends
3. Can we identify, for various land uses or growth patterns, differences in county revenues vs. cost of services?	Strong support generally for more compact forms of growth (in keypad, surveys, chip game, and meeting comments)		<p>Difficult to extract precise numbers. There are many County costs that are independent of a particular growth pattern. However, intuitively there is a modest benefit to compact growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sheriff's office: difference in policing rates</li> <li>▪ Road mile/house for various densities</li> <li>▪ Wyoming: cost of service differences for rural vs. suburban land uses.</li> </ul> <p>There are also many other reasons than fiscal to support more compact forms of growth...</p>		
4. What are the fiscal consequences of the proposed future development?	Schools impact fee too low	FG: Education Sector	<p>Clustered growth is somewhat more efficient. Growth in and near existing centers is the most efficient.</p> <p>However, this presumes that the County is not in the "urban" business, and that city's provide the urban services.</p>		<p>Mesa County-like fiscal evaluation?</p> <p>For each scenario we are going to compare, at order of magnitude level, differences in cost for:</p> <p>Major roadways needed (const and maint)</p> <p>Services (Sheriff)</p>
5. How do we position ourselves for	Airport has a consultant doing a		Not possible to forecast the future,	(D) Maintain the distinctive rural character of	How much of a premium does it cost to live in

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (D), Policies (P), Actions (A)	Further study needs
the future?	<p>market analysis for business park at airport. Other communities would like similar analysis to help them diversify their economies.</p> <p>Diversify energy production to alternative energies</p> <p>Use our resources in the county, i.e. natural gas energy production, fleet vehicles.</p> <p>Increase solar, geothermal, wind on Grass Mesa, as well as natural gas use within the County</p> <p>We must protect our business environment and diversify our jobs so we can continue to live here</p> <p>Rifle would like the County to assist with critical infrastructure and proper industrial development (development that compliments emerging consumer and residential markets.)</p> <p>Hire an economic coordinator</p> <p>Identify assets, competitive advantage (base analysis) and opportunities</p> <p>Need a County-wide economic coordinator that assists with job creation, marketing</p>	<p>FG: Business and Tourism</p> <p>FG: Former electeds.</p> <p>FG: Business and Tourism.</p> <p>FG: Oil and Gas</p> <p>FG: PC/BOCC</p> <p>Rifle City Meeting</p> <p>Rifle City Meeting</p>	<p>especially out 20 years. There can be significant variations in the trend lines. The best we can do is act conservatively to keep our costs down, keep our quality of life up, and keep our options open.</p> <p>Current economic downturn has many clamoring for more diversity in the local economy—to provide a more stable employment.</p> <p>This economy has spared no one—nationally and internationally. GC HAS a diverse economy now. Nevertheless, it is always a high priority is to maintain and expand that diversity of businesses, especially in the long term to offset the high reliance on gas and resort tourism.</p> <p>What are the factors that affect business locations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ cost of living (gas, food, heating, etc.)</li> <li>▪ education of the work force</li> <li>▪ quality of life for employees (community, environment, schools, shopping, recreation)</li> <li>▪ access to markets</li> </ul> <p>Currently each community is on its own to develop an economic strategy, with little resource, and potential duplication.</p>	<p>GC.</p> <p>(D) Assure the on-going viability of CMC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ create a center there?</li> </ul> <p>D) Assure regional availability of affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ County plays a coordinator role to bring about good solutions</li> </ul> <p>(A) Do a regional economic strategy analysis (building on County study for airport land), with participation by all communities.</p> <p>(A) County-wide economic development coordinator?</p>	<p>Garfield County? Compare with other communities? (BBC)</p>
6. What are possible options for funding needed improvements? What do we need to prepare for?	Grants – Governor’s Energy Office	FG: Oil and Gas.			
7. What role does rural agricultural land play on the local/County-wide economy?	<p>Agriculture is a huge factor of ‘who we are’ - yet Ag is not profitable. Only source of income is selling the land.</p> <p>Traditional ag is not a productive on the eastern side of the county,</p>	<p>Focus Group F</p> <p>Large Land Owners</p> <p>FG: Land Development</p>	<p>City properties pay a larger share of County property tax than agricultural and residential uses in the unincorporated areas.</p>		<p>Reach out to other large land owners</p> <p>Western Water Conservancy District</p> <p>IGA – Town of Silt/Blue Stone Ranch?</p>

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (D), Policies (P), Actions (A)	Further study needs
	possible raised bed, specialization ag				
8. How will the Comp Plan address large land owners?	<p>Plan should be a moving target to address Ag land to rural residential uses.</p> <p>Private property rights: need to protect rights to sell land. Highest and best use values.</p> <p><i>Adaptability and flexibility:</i> keep options for land owners</p> <p><i>Conservation Easements:</i> considered as a 'good option'</p> <p>Land Exchanges: public/private</p> <p>County should encourage public/private land exchanges (BLM/Ag.) Ag is a big user of public lands.</p> <p>Challenge is balance: 'Respectful of private property rights and ability for property owners to be able to do what they can.'</p>	<p>Focus Group F</p> <p>Large Land Owners</p>			<p>Need more property owner (large land owners/ag users) opinions</p> <p>Need to understand why land exchanges work and what impact this has on the Comp Plan (policies).</p>
9. Can we increase cooperation and sales tax or revenue sharing	<p>All Municipalities compete for tax, this is a problem.</p> <p>Revenue funding or Sales tax sharing could work if the County could step forward for marketing and infrastructure development, rife could see regional revenue sharing.</p> <p>Revenue sharing is possible if everyone comes out ahead</p>	<p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>FG: Rifle City</p> <p>FG: Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p>	The benefits would be allowing retail to find the best market-driven location, resulting in less competition for retail, and reduce the need for communities to finance commercial development.		
10. How do we support a construction industry with a boom bust construction cycle?	We should acquire aggregate locally	FG: former electeds.	Not the intent of the County, or the Comp Plan, to support construction industry, except as a means of providing more affordable housing (lower		

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (D), Policies (P), Actions (A)	Further study needs
			construction costs) and part of business diversification.		

## II. Land Use—where and how should we grow?

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source <sup>1</sup>	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
1. What happens if buildout according to current zoning? Will the already approved subdivisions accommodate anticipated growth?			Illustrate in Current Practices” scenario		Inventory of approved-but-unbuilt subdivision lots (RF school district did analysis) Air photo comparison of historical changes?
2. What areas are suitable, likely, for development?	<p>Aspen Valley Land Trust (AVLT) encourages stronger inter-activity between land developers, County and municipalities in long term land use planning efforts. Open space initiatives county-wide.</p> <p>Sunlight would like to upgrade its infrastructure upgraded components require surrounding real estate.</p> <p>Rifle convergence of Rail/Highway/Airport</p> <p>Airport Commercial target is 2 ½ mile drive</p> <p>Many area throughout the County are subdivided but not yet built (6000 lots ready in Spring Valley), not necessarily suitable, but likely West Glenwood and airport area</p>	<p>Focus Group G: Public Lands/Recreation</p> <p>FG: Business and Tourism</p> <p>FG: Business and Tourism</p> <p>FG: Business and Tourism</p> <p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p> <p>Glenwood Springs Public Meeting</p>	Does the County continue to approve subdivisions that require hauling of water?	<p>P. Water providers that provide agreement-to-serve letters are required to hold in reserve the capacity required to serve the cumulative letters that have been provided. (may not double commit).</p> <p>P. Develop where there is existing infrastructure</p>	<p>Slope</p> <p>Able to be served with infrastructure (affordably)</p> <p>Water availability (consultants)</p> <p>Map areas that haul water.</p>

<sup>1</sup> SG=stakeholder group, KP=keypad polling, GWS=Glenwood Springs

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source <sup>1</sup>	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>is suitable for high density.</p> <p>Suitable land is land that is already served with existing infrastructure</p> <p>Battlement Mesa</p> <p>Iron Bridge, CMC Spring Valley, Cattle Creek Crossing Catherine Store, Near Gateway of 82 into Carbondale. Elk Meadow, Sunlight,</p>	Carbondale Public Meeting			
<p>3. Does the county have the tools to regulate the land uses appropriately? (regulation, staff capacity) What is not regulated adequately? Do we adequately preserve rural character? Do we allow incompatible uses adjacent to each other? (real examples or just potential conflicts?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oil and gas?</li> <li>Gravel and mining?</li> <li>Business/commercial?</li> <li>Agribusiness? (allowed in Ag zone)</li> </ul>	<p>Zoning is archaic (not consistent with land use), most development is done via PUD, this is an ok tool, but not too predictable. Need more consistent approach, lower densities are acceptable. Comp plan without rezoning is a waste of time. Cost is 50-60 thousand to amend plan, too costly.</p> <p>Some future Oil and Gas regional offices could locate in Parachute or Rifle</p> <p>County should adopt hard urban growth boundaries.</p> <p>County should use zoning, perhaps update, to encourage development in the City</p>	<p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>FG: Oil and Gas.</p> <p>Glenwood Springs Public Meeting</p> <p>FG: Former officials.</p>		Action: Rezoning	<p>Overview of current regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses allowed/not allowed (matrix?)</li> <li>Compatibility requirements</li> <li>Diagrams?</li> </ul> <p>Present to public in keypad format?</p> <p>GIS analysis of where current zoning is inconsistent with CP designation.</p>
<p>4. To what extent should “non-rural” densities be allowed in the unincorporated area?</p>	<p>Spring Valley Campus Expansion, affordable housing</p> <p>AT Cattle Creek Crossing</p> <p>County should allow some urban development in the County, at highway 82 and 114</p> <p>If the County allows urban development without services, developers and special districts will provide what services they can.</p>	<p>FG: Education Sector</p> <p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>FG: BOCC/PC</p> <p>FG: BOCC/PC</p>	<p>Increased levels of urbanization increase expected levels of service. The smaller the lots, the greater the number of police calls.</p> <p>The closer a fire station , the lower the fire insurance rating and the lower the premium.</p> <p>In Spring Valley, response time is already very low.</p>	Special Districts used to help create the infrastructure?	<p>Current policies on allowing higher densities in unincorporated area.</p> <p>Variation in cost of fire insurance relative to ISO ratings. (check stds, call insurance agent)</p>

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source <sup>1</sup>	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>ISDS individual waste water systems are a big concern</p> <p>The County is in the business today, but does little to understand the effect of congestion/traffic, how to incorporate transit; a full understanding of urban impacts must be explored when creating urban development</p> <p>Where they already are and take advantage of existing infrastructure, i.e. Battlement Mesa.</p> <p>Ski area should allow more density/commercial</p> <p>The County must eliminate these or work on a revenue sharing</p> <p>Lower density in existing subdivisions</p>	<p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p> <p>Glenwood Springs Public Meeting</p> <p>Glenwood Springs Public Meeting</p>			
5. To what extent should commercial and industrial uses be allowed in the unincorporated areas of the County?	<p>Rolleston Exit</p> <p>No large scale commercial development in County b/c Cities often take the brunt of the residential development without commercial sales tax to off-set</p> <p>Spring Valley with some mixed Use</p> <p>Bear Ranch with transit</p>	<p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p>	<p>County commercial uses compete directly with commercial in cities. At the same time, commercial “islands” could serve existing residential enclaves and reduce driving for services and work.</p>	<p>A. Commercial and industrial uses allowed anywhere in unincorporated areas.</p> <p>B. Commercial and industrial uses allowed in designated “nodes” NOT adjacent to existing cities.</p> <p>C. Commercial and industrial uses not allowed in unincorporated areas.</p>	<p>Check current county criteria for commercial and industrial zoning/land use (2000 CP, zoning regs).</p>
6. Need a definition of Recreation zone	<p>Zone is undefined, includes ski area, golf course, rock garden.</p> <p>Should follow historic uses – rafting, Sunlight, Golf. Encourage development of rec resources.</p>	<p>Bus / Tourism SG</p>			
7. Need a direction on the ski area	<p>Facility is aging, viable as a day ski area, has a substandard access road.</p>	<p>Bus./Tourism SG</p>	<p>Ski area has proposed major residential development to help fund improvements and operations. Puts</p>	<p>A. Ski area is allowed to develop major residential component to become destination resort.</p>	<p>Ski area show up in any other survey info?</p>

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source <sup>1</sup>	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	GWS community strongly supports the ski area as a quality of life amenity.	GWS CP KP	additional pressure on County or GWS to make road upgrades and higher maintenance levels.	B. County referendum to publicly fund ski area road improvements. C. Ski area continues as private operation without significant additional residential development. May not survive.	GWS direction?
8. How does oil/gas wells impact land development opportunities?	Comment: Rather have oil/gas wells rather than 1 house (commentary on land use comparison)	Focus Group F: Large Land Owners			
9. Private property recreational designation	Sam: large ranch property owner commented that a private property recreation designation should be included on land use plan	Focus Group F: Large Land Owners	Not clear as to the advantages or disadvantages to considering this option		
10. Rural land home sites	Rural home site proliferation is an environmental catastrophe. Summary: Push development into urban areas. Make rural home site development of higher quality. Infrastructure cost of developing land needs to go up(?)	Focus Group F: Large Land Owners			
11. Can Transfer of Development Rights work?	Not a significant advantage, doesn't work.	Focus Group F: Large Land Owners	Steve Mullen asked the question regarding cluster development.		
12. Sand/gravel operations and conflicts w/habitat restoration efforts.	Vegetation (cottonwood restoration) is impacted by sand/gravel operations. Need to identify future sand/gravel sites and improve reclamation best management practices County-wide.	Focus Group G: Public Lands/Recreation			
13. Can we have time dependent development in rural areas? Not reducing right, but controlling when growth occurs.					
14. Where is large scale alternative development appropriate in Garfield County		FG: Oil and Gas		Grass Mesa – Wind Turbines? (what about avigation?)	
15. Can we identify carrying capacity for the Valley?	Is there a maximum buildout for	FG: PC and BOCC			

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source <sup>1</sup>	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>the County            Measure resource base, to use data to drive plan. Identify carrying capacity.</p>				

### III. Staying in Balance with Our Natural Resources (Environment, Recreation and Open Space)

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
1. Where are our natural resources and who manages them?	<p>DOW and USFS both are actively engaged in planning for natural resources.</p> <p>DOW: concerned with habitat loss impacts wildlife, energy development considered as a negative impact on habitat and statewide big game species corridors.</p> <p>Agricultural land is now mostly oil in Eastern County</p> <p>Air quality issues, w/ energy fields, where only @ 1/10 of way. Consider Moffat County and power plant b/c of wilderness area downwind</p> <p>How do we address aesthetic /better building practices in river corridors.</p> <p>Riparian buffer along rivers</p>	<p>Focus Group G: Public Lands/Recreation</p> <p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>FG: PC/BOCC</p> <p>FG: PC/BOCC</p> <p>Glenwood Springs Public Meeting</p>	<p>The only comment received in public input so far regards elk (and deer?) migration routes— primarily crossing Hwy 82.</p> <p>What are current County regulations/policies regarding floodplain, wildlife habitat, T&amp;E species?</p>	A.	<p>Mapping of natural resources, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Productive agricultural land (related to irrigation),</li> <li>• Water</li> <li>• Wildlife habitat (elk migration routes— see info provided by Frosty in Carbondale)</li> <li>• Sensitive ecosystems</li> <li>• Sand and gravel</li> <li>• Oil and gas</li> <li>• Natural recreation areas</li> </ul> <p>Review current regs and 2000 CP regarding wildlife habitat vs. development.</p>
2. Who has jurisdiction and who can influence their preservation?	<p>Impediments: County cooperation w/cities/towns.</p> <p>Water is regionally governed by two separate entities: NWCOG and AG NC</p> <p>DOW/USFS both are considered jurisdictional player who have in</p>	<p>Focus Group C: Natural Resources/Water</p>			<p>Identify land managers (fed, state, local agencies)</p> <p>Map of Eagle Valley Land Trust and Aspen Valley Land Trust holdings in Garfield County.</p>
3. Are any of those resources threatened by future growth? Or pose a threat TO future growth?	<p>Loss of Ag. land</p> <p>Energy development buying up Ag. land</p>	<p>Focus Group C: Natural Resources/Water</p>			<p>Related to scenario development</p>

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>Shale: water consumptive/water rights</p> <p>50's-60's: Conditional water rights to absolute water rights</p> <p>Water Quality is problematic due to methane and other less slippery contaminants. Most problematic is Jolly Mesa to Grass Mesa south of I70.</p> <p>Might help to map water well and which ones are dry.</p> <p>County stance – industry can not develop if you need to hall water, but rural development (residential) is allowed to hall water.</p> <p>Water might be a limiting factor to future development</p>	FG: Oil and gas			
4. How much water do we have and can it be transferred to where is may be needed?	Area south of Silt has little water	FG: Oil and Gas			
5. How critical is availability of water?	<p>Water is key: south side of river limited to no water</p> <p>Flow in Colorado, cameo may go down when flow drops and salinity rises.</p>	<p>Focus Group F: Large Land owners</p> <p>FG: Former Electeds.</p>			
6. How important is trails and open space planning to County residents?	<p>Lower Valley Trails Association (LOVA) and Animas Valley Land Trust (AVLT) – promote Colorado River Trail corridor planning and land set asides for trail access.</p> <p>Universal value (County-wide): River access.</p> <p>Preserve railroad corridors as potential trail corridors County-wide.</p> <p>This is a beautiful area, trails and open space are important.</p>	<p>Focus Group G: Public Lands/Recreation</p> <p>FG: PC/BOCC</p> <p>Glenwood</p>	<p>Open space and trail funding programs may have strong support to initiate policy programs.</p> <p>Ongoing revenue funding will be a source of concern in difficult economic times. Refer to LOVA Master Plan 2000</p>	<p>Establish a formal policy supporting open space and trails county-wide.</p> <p>Consider a river-corridor overlay zone to i</p> <p>Use clustering to help establish connected open space corridors.</p>	

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	County needs a provision for open space, Martino Ranch developer wanted to give away 1000 plus acres, but no one wanted it. Open Space as community buffers Parachute/Battlement Mesa want a trail between the two	Springs City Meeting Glenwood Springs Public Meeting Battlement Mesa meeting.			
7.	County/USFS coordination on trail access for multi-uses (equestrian) uses should be ongoing.	Focus Group G: Public Lands/Recreation			
8. Does the County want to develop/have a Carbon Policy?	New Castle has one, County should	New Castle City Meeting			
9. Clean, Green energy			Clean energy initiatives in Garfield county include: NECI (Garfield New Energy Communities Initiative) <a href="http://www.garfieldcleanenergy.org/">http://www.garfieldcleanenergy.org/</a> CLEER (Clean Energy Economy for the Region) <a href="http://www.cleanenergyeconomy.net/about.html">http://www.cleanenergyeconomy.net/about.html</a> These groups appear to be focused primarily on education and advocacy of adopting clean energy practices.	P: Compact growth reduces VMT and hydrocarbon consumption. P: Regional transit further reduces VMT Action?: Set energy consumption guidelines? Action: Establish guidelines for wind and solar before it becomes an issue. ????	Have they established any county-wide goals? Has the County endorsed any clean energy goals?
10. Balance scenic quality and energy development	New Castle – how do we balance scenic quality and energy, including alternative energy development Finding balance of energy w/ hunting fishing and wildlife – We rely on viewsheds, pristine vistas, we must carefully direct mineral extraction How do we deal with impact from energy after oil is gone; we expect energy industry to parcel and sell. We need a balance b/t economic development of oil/gas and benefit of a sound ecological system (wildlife and tourism)	New Castle Meeting  FG: PC/BOCC  FG: PC/BOCC  Glenwood Springs City Meeting			

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
11. How do we deal with Wildlife and transportation	Need to ensure we protect wildlife crossings.	Carbondale Public Meeting			

#### IV. Transportation

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
1. What are current conditions of County roads?	<p>Police don't know status of individual roads—county, private, public use, etc.</p> <p>Can't enforce highway regulations on private roads.</p> <p>People are fencing inside ROW's (right on the road).</p> <p>Need to core the roads, don't know structural capability of farm to market roads (years of chip seal).</p> <p>CDOT doesn't have funding to improve County/State road intersections (20 intersections).</p>				
2. What is the County's appropriate role in regional transportation? Is County participation in RFTA or another regional agency) to the benefit of County taxpayers?	<p>Battlement Mesa would like to be part of a regional transit network.</p> <p>Rifle is cautious of RAFTA b/c once you get in you can't get out. Has a host of issues associated with taking their residents to Aspen (security, latch key kids...) No transparency in cost. They would join with an Equitable seat at the table.</p> <p>Should the County take the lead or a leadership role rather than just being concerned with maintaining existing roads?</p> <p>Don't let development drive decisions – let planning drive decisions.</p> <p>Transportation planning is a</p>	Focus Group J: Transportation	<p>Neither Rifle nor Garfield County belongs to RFTA. Rifle is considering withdrawing its financial support from RFTA and joining a separate transit authority that would potentially serve the I-70 corridor, perhaps from Parachute (and perhaps Mesa County) to Glenwood (possibly to Dotsero).</p> <p>Glenwood reasons for joining RFTA – importing workers into Glenwood and not so much exporting workers north to Aspen.</p> <p>There are different transportation needs between the western and eastern portions of the county</p>	<p>Determine County's role in regional transportation issues, planning and programming, coordination w/CDOT.</p> <p>Address sustainability with discussions on: Re-newables Smaller footprints</p>	

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>regional issue - communities need to stay involved to raise transportation conversation to another level.</p> <p>Discussion on forming a COG or MPO to address regional transportation (funding, services, maintenance, etc.)</p>		Actual traffic congestion is concentrated in Glenwood Springs	<p>Longer term jobs</p> <p>Alternative transportation</p>	
3. Are more consistent road standards needed between cities and county in UGBs?	<p>Intersection design standards and jurisdictional areas between County and State Highways is an issue. Better coordination is needed.</p> <p>Funding issues – not enough revenue to fund transportation improvements</p> <p>Revenue sharing</p> <p>Transportation should be viewed as a utility.</p>	Focus Group J: Transportation	<p>Comment was made that a high priority is needed to change the way transportation is viewed..that transportation must be viewed as a regional issue, not just 6 or 7 different communities trying to address transportation.</p> <p>There is an ownership perception problem County-wide. Who is responsible</p> <p>Different jurisdictions – different mandates; CDOT – moving traffic</p> <p>Towns – functionality and aesthetics</p> <p>Each community contributes to the problem</p> <p>Distrust of up-valley communities</p> <p>Needs of people using Hwy 82 corridor are different from those using I-70 corridor.</p>	<p>Actions: better understanding of CDOT TRP and design review (access management) process is needed by all jurisdictions (public works and planning agencies).</p> <p>Identify traffic capacity in the County (intersections and roadways).</p> <p>There must be a willingness to say ‘no’ to developments that do not meet certain growth criteria or locations deemed appropriate for growth.</p>	
4. Where, if any, would it be appropriate to introduce alternative transportation modes (bikes) in County standards?	Pedestrian trails are lacking	Focus Group J: Transportation		Identify areas within say 2 miles from existing or potential centers.	
5. Do current County access standards promote the right kind of development? (drive accesses reduce road capacities?)				Assessment of current road standards relative to future potential densities.	
6. How to assure the ongoing success of the County airport?	Avigation easements are needed to assure development doesn't compromise flight operations.	Bus./Tourism SG		P.	

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>A big issue is inability to find quality employees.</p> <p>There will be a general shortage of pilots in the next 10 years as major portion retires and few new entering.</p>				
7. How high of a priority is multi-modal programming in the County?	County road and roadway design standards should include widened shoulders to accommodate bicycle travel.	Focus Group G: Public Lands/Recreation			
8. How to appropriately deal with encroachment on ROW	Roads are narrow & people building fences to the roads. Right of ways vary and no complete survey exists.	Lunch with Staff			
9. What are Garfield County's strategic corridors?	<p>State Highway 13 north is the transportation hub for future natural gas and oil shale.</p> <p>How do we approach highway 82/traffic and business.</p> <p>Highway 6/24 – we need to determine where the industry should be</p>	<p>FG: Oil and Gas.</p> <p>FG: BOCC/PC</p> <p>Glenwood Springs Public Meeting</p>			
10. What about a back entrance to Sunlight?	Rifle				

**Airport**

Vision: gradual evolution from 40% destination flights/60% diversion from Aspen/Eagle to 50%/50%. Change from mom/pop to business airport.

GWS=small planes, twin engine max. Grand Junction= commercial operation.

New runway next year will meet the needs for 20 years.

Capacity of airport will be 120,000 landings and takeoffs (60,000 aircraft), at 24,000 today.

In 20 years GarCo airport will have built out hangar capacity

No additional hangar capacity in Aspen/Eagle.

Have purchased 5 of the 7 aviation easements necessary to protect 5 mile periphery. Next priority: 10 mile periphery. – nothing over 50 feet, no silo, reflections, no wildlife...

Costs \$120k per acre to buy land near airport (easements are less expensive).

A single operator owns both Aspen and GarCo fixed-base operation, so they are not threatened by GarCo expansion.

Airport has a consultant evaluating markets for airport business park.

[Airport commercial target is 2 ½ mile drive](#)

#### Key Findings of Focus Group G (Transportation)

- There is a difference between the state highway vision and the community vision
- Major growth issues throughout the County
- Garfield County needs intersection improvements
- There are major safety issues throughout the county
- Need to protect corridor ROW
- The county and communities need long term revenue source (improvement district)
- The county and the communities need to think in a more regional manner to solve many of the transportation problems
- Need invest in transit in the county
- Need to improve access to transit
- Need to move to a more multi modal transportation system
- Major issues with affordable housing in the upper valley
- The is the issues of commute to employment from the lower valley to the upper valley

#### KEY TOPICS:

A. What road system, improvements, policies are necessary to sustain future growth?

B. What is the appropriate role of transit in the County and who should be responsible?

C. How to resolve County/State intersection funding issues?

## V. Work, Housing

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
Where do our workers live, where do they work, and how do they get back and forth?	<p>Spring Valley affordable and workforce housing is necessary</p> <p>Workers are located throughout the County</p> <p>Principle means of transportation – single-occupant vehicle</p> <p>What % is via transit?</p>	FG: Education sector.		<p>Summary of housing</p> <p>Verify Housing/Commercial linkage Study findings From Transportation Master Plan— identify travel routes</p>	<p>P. Given the physical constraints to expanding traffic through Glenwood, it is imperative to develop a holistic housing strategy for the Glenwood-to-Aspen corridor.</p>
What are our current deficits? Are the standards in the TMP appropriate?				<p>From TMP, summarize (in general terms) current conditions and improvement needs</p> <p>Road improvements</p> <p>Intersections</p>	<p>P. Due to fiscal constraints the County places its highest priority for new roads (and accepting roads from others) on roads that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ serve the greatest population</li> <li>▪ complete missing links to lessen congestion</li> <li>▪ provide essential emergency access</li> </ul>
How can Garfield County address affordable housing?	<p>Impact fees are better than inclusionary requirements b/c many developments are too small and the county can develop where they want.</p> <p>Spring Valley affordable housing is necessary</p> <p>Garfield County Housing Authority should formalize role as regional coordinator.</p> <p>Housing is an intra-county issue – Pitkin should be involved here as well.</p> <p>Glenwood Springs wants to see a regional housing agency, willing to contribute their fair share</p>	<p>FG: Land Development.</p> <p>FG: Education sector.</p> <p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p>			
Can a voluntary inclusionary program be effective to address the affordable housing needs County-wide?	<p>Housing is a regional problem and beyond (multi-county).</p> <p>Housing plan needs to speak to</p>	Focus Group A; Housing	Communities in the County seem to have different requirements/programs – can this be an effective way to address	<p>MOVE THIS TO TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>Need to review regional Housing Authority's</p>	

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
<p>Are the affordable/attainable housing issues in the County being addressed comprehensively /collectively? Are all communities on the same page and working together from a policy perspective?</p>	<p>education regionally.  Lead: Regional Housing Authority  Reduce overlap in services  Staffing &amp; office equipment biggest operational costs  General consensus of not favoring creating new services.  Aspen has an ambitious affordable housing program  Glenwood Springs has an inclusionary zoning requirement (15%) Verify?  Housing Authority manages Section 8 housing program. 72% utilized  12 single-family senior housing units in Parachute  Development in Silt for sale  Rifle: surplus of townhome/condo's (in the affordable market range)  Mountain Regional Housing maintains 74 deed restricted housing units, home buyer and down payment assistance program. Several approved lots are un-built due to the economy.  Carbondale has 60-units, residential owner occupied(RDO)  A 20% affordable housing requirement is in place for new developments of 5 units or more (150% AMI)  Feed my Sheep – cliental varies, Garfield Co a catchment between Denver and Grand Junction  New Castle: 2 units for transitional housing.</p>		<p>affordable/attainable housing in the County?   Perceptions: General increase I numbers of affordable/attainable housing qualified.  Construction industry down.  Funding resources have gone down.  More difficult to obtain extractions from development community in poor economy.   Inclusionary zoning approach should be consistent throughout cities and County.   Housing has direct linkages to commercial uses (and transportation networks).   Pool funds for buy-downs county-wide – make available to all communities in the County (County has the money through real estate transfer funds – should be verified).   Look to County to discourage development in un-incorporated areas. Look at growth boundary areas (3-mile areas) as focus for new development.   Keep housing as close as possible.</p>	<p>role and positioning in the County. Could this entity be funded through a County-wide funding program?  Explore further the relationship of the Housing Authority, housing non-profits and cities/towns to ensure streamline efforts and reduce any potential overlaps in services and policies.</p>	
<p>Are housing, growth management and</p>	<p>Comp Plan should address how</p>		<p>From a long-term, community</p>	<p>Through scenario development identify</p>	

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
transportation being addressed simultaneously as joint issues?	cities/towns are to be involved in the process of discussions – annexation issues become important (how to leverage annexations).		perspective, the most sustainable neighborhoods will be those that have a variety of unit types to accommodate life stages, and are walkable to frequent services.	major transportation needs (LSC input) such as where growth might require major road widening or new roads. Show how transit might change needs?	
Funding for housing	Affordable housing (costs) still very high. Foreclosures going up. Biggest need in rental market area. A dedicated funding program in Carbondale would be good (true for any community in Garfield Co.) Lack of dedicated funding system County-wide				

## VI. Intergovernmental Coordination

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
1. Is there a consistent vision between the County and the cities within the County?	No County thinks they are agrarian, but mostly they manage industrial development and are residentially a suburban county. Common concern that 3 person body does not represent entire district City/County Joint purchase of Rail Road and then County was trying to give away portions to individual land owners.	Glenwood Springs City Meeting  Glenwood Springs City Meeting			
2. What should be the County's policies with the UGBs?	If the City's are pushing for growth, smart growth the County should support this Cities have updated their plans and these plans should be reflected in the UGB area Joint planning should be done in	FG: BOCC/PC  FG: BOCC/PC  Glenwood Springs City			

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	these areas and the County should accommodate individual city's future land use	Meeting			
<p>3. How does the plan address regional issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing affordability</li> <li>Traffic/transportation</li> <li>Water quality and quantity</li> </ul>	<p>Regional Grant coordination through Garfield County.</p> <p>I should ensure that the full resources of municipalities and County resources are used to analyze issues</p> <p>Regional issues increase/decrease with economic growth, i.e. housing is less an issue now than 2 years ago, how do we keep focused now?</p> <p>Provide general consensus on the need for better cooperation and communications on housing issues, reduce redundancy and overlap and endorse the Housing Authority to be the lead agency supported with a funding mechanism County/city/town wide.</p>	<p>FG: oil and gas</p> <p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p> <p>FG: Former Electeds.</p> <p>FG: Housing</p>			
4. What is the role of RFTA in regional issues?	Rifle doesn't get input into RAFTA decision	Rifle City Meeting			
3. If there are separate planning areas, how are they handled administratively?				<p>A. Sub-area values reflected in referral process.</p> <p>B. Sub-area values reflected in individualized review process.</p> <p>C. Sub-area values reflected in separate guidelines/policies. (requires clear boundaries)</p>	
4. Communities want their local plans given greater authority in land use decisions within their area of influence	<p>Local CPs include desired land use patterns in adjacent areas (UGBs).</p> <p>Referral policy between Cities and County, but expand and create Joint review board</p> <p>"Eastern" cities desire focused growth within their various town</p>	<p>New Castle City Meeting</p> <p>Rifle/New Castle City Meetings</p>	Inconsistent actions by County can inhibit their ability to grow cost-effectively and in a coordinated fashion. 2-acre lots are the LEAST likely to be subdivided in the future. Therefore, 2 acre zoning by County has potential to create growth barrier around cities.	<p>A. UGB plans will be considered by County PC</p> <p>B. UGB plans will be followed unless it creates a hardship on property owner.</p> <p>C. UGB plans are adopted into County CP and followed unless there is a compelling public benefits to do otherwise.</p>	

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>core areas feathering out.</p> <p>Pitkin County IGA could be a model; it allows stakeholders to weigh in before the process is cast/hardened. The problem is Municipalities don't think Garfield cares about their plans.</p> <p>County Decision have a large impact on traffic within Cities</p> <p>Round table meetings with Planning and Zoning boards from all municipalities</p> <p>If towns want density, County should encourage development within the town, even though regulations may make it more difficult to develop in town.</p>	<p>FG: Land Development</p> <p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p> <p>Rifle City Meeting.</p>			
5. Communities want more effective input into land use/transportation decisions in their vicinity.	<p>Feeling is that they send in comments, and even come to hearings, and their input is ignored. Also, the referral to them comes relatively late in the process, after much effort has been expended and positions have become hardened.</p> <p>Issues the municipalities should like have input on include – water quality/watershed, land use.</p> <p>If Cities desire smart growth they should have it.</p> <p>Cities should have input in analysis of potential projects, this would allow a combination of resources.</p>	<p>New Castle City Meeting</p> <p>PC/BOCC</p> <p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p>		<p>A. For projects within a UGB, the PC sends a referral to local community.</p> <p>B. For projects within a UGB, the applicant first submits for comments to the local jurisdiction, then applies to County.</p> <p>C. For projects within a UGB, the County PC is expanded to include the local PC (votes count equally)</p> <p>D. The County PC is expanded (or reorganized) to permanently include seats for representatives of various sub areas.</p> <p>Action: Develop/refine binding IGA</p>	
6. Desire expressed for greater intra-city coordination.	<p>Sonoran Institute recently convened city planning commissions (and staffs?).</p> <p>Participants felt that exchange of issues and ideas was very positive.</p> <p>Community Separator desired between New Castle and Silt in</p>	<p>New Castle City Meeting</p> <p>Glenwood</p>		<p>A. Local jurisdictions get together on ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>B. County convenes regular (annual, quarterly, etc.) round-table of planning commissions and staffs.</p> <p>C.</p>	

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	<p>Peach Valley</p> <p>Regional Revenue Sharing to eliminate competition and encourage a holistic commercial planning; Everyone comes out ahead</p> <p>Glenwood springs wasn't aware of other UGB</p>	<p>Springs City Meeting</p> <p>Glenwood Springs City Meeting</p>			
7. How to bring about more effective regional, cooperative actions that transcend Garfield County boundaries?		FG: Business and Tourism	A number of issues faced by Garfield County communities transcend their own boundaries, and even those of the County. These issues are potentially addressed more effectively on a regional basis. RFTA is one agency addressing transit on a regional level, <a href="#">watershed issues</a> , <a href="#">housing</a>	<p>A. Garfield County takes the lead in convening an annual regional forum to exchange information and spur cooperative action.</p> <p>B. Form regional agencies to address: affordable housing.</p>	Discuss idea with housing authority
5. Work with Education sector	<p>Boards are not educated b/t the relationship between land use and the comprehensive effect of the decisions they are making.</p> <p>Schools have tried developing and have begun to sort through many of the short fall of that process, design not affordable, creating a "teacher slum"</p> <p>Difficult to predict where land will be required as the comp plan is subjectively applied, rural development practice (urban development in rural area) has schools purchase land in-between municipal boundaries.</p> <p>Educate the Board of Education and the Board of County Commissioners to integrate municipal and County Comp Plans</p> <p>Need to reevaluate impact fees, much higher in Carbondale.</p> <p>Safe-routes 2 School</p> <p>Associate school locations with</p>	<p>FG: Education Sector</p> <p>FG: Education Sector</p> <p>FG: Education Sector</p> <p>FG: Education Sector</p> <p>FG: Education Sector</p> <p>Glenwood Springs Public Meeting</p>	<p>Coordination to create affordable housing is necessary.</p>		

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
	density				
<p><b>Public Health and Safety</b></p> <p>Subdivision standards in the County (e.g. lower standards than municipal level standards - curb and gutter, quality of construction, etc.) can be related to varying degrees of sense of community which affects crime rates/types.</p> <p>Higher expectation of services call in urban areas relates to higher frequency of calls and response times.</p> <p>Fewer calls (?) in rural areas</p> <p>Staff levels and budgets have decreased in Carbondale and Rifle. County Sheriff budget has remained constant.</p> <p>Housing accommodations for emergency response staff/volunteers is impacted by cost of housing. Requires incentives to locates near stations</p> <p>6.</p>	<p><b>Key findings:</b></p> <p>Cross jurisdictional areas are prevalent; multiple agencies provide multiple services throughout the County.</p> <p>Significant time/resources are attributed to transportation and safety (traffic management) by all agencies.</p> <p>Healthy community initiatives are present in the County (Safe/healthy communities, environmental health, public health and teen driving programs)</p> <p>Socio/economic shifts in the County affect crime rates and service calls</p>	<p>Focus Group K: Public Health and Safety</p>	<p>County Sheriff office is interested in participating in determining what lands to be designated as open space (for future patrol requirements).</p> <p>Favors clustering and infill with a focus on growth in or near cities//towns as a preferred growth pattern.</p>		

## VII. Public Services

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
1.				<p>P: While the County unequivocally recognizes property rights, the right to develop one's property does not obligate the County to provide services to support that development, especially if it burdens the County disproportionately or inhibits the ability of the County to develop in a cost-effective manner.</p>	
2. Are public services supported by					

Questions/Issues	Public Input Comments	Source	Observations (by planning team)	Potential Directions (A-D), Policies (P), Actions	Further study needs
"gentlemen's agreements" sustainable?					
3. Are certain areas of the county underserved?					
4. Road maintenance issues	Many roads farm to market roads, where capped, but may not have appropriate infrastructure.	Staff			
5. What safety improvements are required for growth?	Substation in Parachute likely New Jail.	Staff			
6. What waste management practices are desired	Composting	Staff			
7. Development in the County creates a potential public service problem, at what level can we allow development in the County and still provide service	When sales tax is how municipalities fund service and commercial locates in the County, service provision is not sustainable	FG: Former officials.			